REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of April 28, 2009 the Applicant respectfully submits the below Remarks.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending independent claim 1, and claims 3-5, 7, 13, 31, 37-41 and 49 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by any one or more of previously cited Martin, Nozawa, Edrinn, Stoffel and Goldstein in view of newly cited Rhoads, for at least the following reasons.

Pending claim 1 recites a method that comprises adjusting a distance between the printhead and the continuous media web by adjusting adjusters on a rail removably supporting the printhead in the printer. The Examiner admits that none of the previously cited references disclose such a feature but contends that Rhoads makes up for this deficiency.

However, in the arrangement disclosed by the Rhoads, the carriage assembly 20 is supported by both the slider rod 6 and the slider bar 8 and only a position of the slider rod 6 is adjustable (see col. 5, lines 56-59 and col. 7, line 64-col. 8, line 25). This arrangement is distinguished from the method of the claimed invention as follows.

Firstly, one of ordinary skill in the art understands that the cylindrical "rod" of Rhoads does not constitute a "rail", since a rail is by definition a flat "bar" not a cylindrical rod (see http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/rail%5B1%5D), and this distinction is clarified by the specific use of a "rod" and a "bar" in Rhoads. Thus, Rhoads does not teach or suggest "adjusting adjusters on a rail removably supporting the printhead" as is required by the claimed invention.

Secondly, because only the slider rod is adjusted in Rhoads and not the slider bar as well, the carriage assembly clearly pivots with respect to slider bar. As such, the printhead is tilted with respect to the media in Rhoads as the slider rod is moved. Thus, Rhoads does not teach or suggest "adjusting a distance between the printhead and the continuous media web" as is required by the claimed invention, rather despite what is disclosed in Rhoads, one

of ordinary skill in the art understands that Rhoads actually adjusts a tilt of the printhead relative to the media.

Therefore, no combination of Rhoads with the previously cited references would result in the method of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:

Kia Silverbrook

Tobin Allen King

Janette Faye Lee

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia
Email: patentdept@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762